arXiv:math/0009064v1 [math.LO] 6 Sep 2000

ON NICE EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS ON ${}^\lambda 2$

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

§0 Introduction

The main question here is the possible generalization of the following theorem on "simple" equivalence relation on ${}^\omega 2$ to higher cardinals.

0.1 Theorem. *1) Assume that*

(a) *E is a Borel 2-place relation on ${}^\omega 2$*

(b) *E is an equivalence relation*

(c) *if $\eta,\nu \in {}^\omega 2$ and $(\exists ! n)(\eta(n) \ne \nu(n))$, $\underline{\text{then}}$ η,ν are not E-equivalent.*

$\underline{\text{Then}}$ there is a perfect subset of ${}^\omega 2$ of pairwise non E-equivalent members.
2) Instead of "E is Borel", "E is analytic (or even a Borel combination of analytic relations)" is enough.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing
This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 724.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

3) If E is a π^1_2 relation which is an equivalence relation satisfying clauses (b) + (c) in $\mathbf{V}^{\text{Cohen}}$, then the conclusion of (1) holds.

See [Sh 273], it was used to prove a result on the homotopy group: if X is Hausdorff metric, compact, separable, arc-connected, locally arc-connected and the homotopy group is not finitely generated then it has cardinality continuum; the proof of 0.1 used forcing in [Sh 273], see [PaSr98] for eliminating the forcing.

We may restrict E to be like $r_p(\text{Ext}(G, \mathbb{Z}))$ or just closer to group theory as in Grossberg Shelah [GrSh 302], [GrSh 302a], Mekler Roslanowski Shelah [MRSh 314], [Sh 664]. In §5 we say somewhat more.
We here continue [Sh 664] but do not rely on it.

Turning to ${}^\lambda 2$ the problem split according to the character of λ and the "simplicity" of E. If E is π^1_1 and $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$ (or just $(Dl)_\lambda$ holds) a generalization holds. If E is $\Sigma^1_1, \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ the generalization in general fails; all this in §1. Now if λ is singular, strong limit for simplicity, it is natural to consider ${}^{\text{cf}(\lambda)}\lambda$ instead of ${}^\lambda 2$. If λ has uncountable cofinality we get strong negative results in §2. If λ has countable cofinality, and is the limit of "somewhat large cardinals", e.g. measurable cardinals, (but $\lambda = \aleph_\omega$ may be O.K., i.e. consistently) the generalization holds (in §3), but if the universe is closed to L (e.g. in L there is no weakly compact or just no Erdos cardinal) then we get negative results (see §4). Note that theorems of the form "if E has many equivalence classes it has continuum" do not generalize well, see [ShVs 719] even for weakly compact.

0.2 Definition. For a cardinal λ and let $\mathscr{B}_\lambda$ be ${}^\lambda 2$ (or ${}^\lambda\lambda$ or ${}^{\text{cf}(\lambda)}\lambda$).
1) For a logic $\mathscr{L}$ we say that E is a $\mathscr{L}$-nice, say 2-place for simplicity, relation on $\mathscr{B}$ if there is a model M with universe λ and finite vocabulary τ, and unary function symbols $F_1, F_2 \notin \tau$ (denoting possibly partial unary functions), such that letting $\tau^+ = \tau \cup \{F_1, F_2\}$, for some sentence $\psi = \psi(F_1, F_2)$ in $L(\tau)$ we have

- ⊚ for any $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathscr{B}$ letting $M_{\eta_1,\eta_2} = (M, \eta_1, \eta_2)$ be the τ^+-model expanding M with $F_\ell^{M_{\eta_1,\eta_2}} = \eta_\ell$ we have
  $\eta_1 E \eta_2 \Leftrightarrow (M, \eta_1, \eta_2) \models \psi$.
  We may write $M \models \psi[\eta_1, \eta_2]$ and $\psi[\eta_1, \eta_2, M]$ or $\psi(x, y, M)$ or write $a \subseteq \lambda$ coding M instead of M.

2) E is a π^1_1-relation on $\mathscr{B}$ means that above we allow ψ to be of the form $(\forall X)\varphi, \varphi$ first order or even inductive logic (i.e. we have variables on sets and are allowed to form the first fix point); X vary on sets. Similarly Σ^1_1, π^1_2, projective; writing nice means $\mathscr{L}$ is first order + definition by induction. We may write nice$_{\mathscr{B}}, \Sigma^1_1[\mathscr{B}]$ etc, and may replace $\mathscr{B}$ by λ if $\mathscr{B} = \mathscr{B}_\lambda$. We write very nice for $\mathscr{L}$-nice, $\mathscr{L}$ first order.

Notation:
$(\forall^* i < \delta)$ means "for every large enough $i < \delta$".
$J^{\rm bd}_\delta$ is the ideal of bounded subsets of δ.

0.3 Definition. Let $(D\ell)_\lambda$ means that λ is regular, uncountable and there is $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ such that $\mathscr{P}_\alpha$ is a family of $< \lambda$ subsets of α and for every $X \subseteq \lambda$ the set $\{\delta < \lambda : X \cap \delta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$ is stationary; hence $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$. [By [Sh 460], $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} \ge \beth_\omega \Rightarrow (D\ell)_\lambda$ and (by Kunen) $\lambda = \mu^+ \Rightarrow (D\ell)_\lambda \equiv \diamondsuit_\lambda$].

0.4 Definition. $\mathscr{Q} \subseteq {}^\lambda 2$ is called perfect or λ-perfect if:

- (a) $A \ne \emptyset$
- (b) if $\eta \in A$ then $\{\ell g(\eta \cap \nu) : \nu \in A\backslash\{\eta\}\} \subseteq \lambda$ is unbounded
- (c) $\{\eta \restriction \zeta : \eta \in A, \zeta \le \lambda\}$ is closed under the union of $\triangleleft$-increasing sequences.

Equivalently, $\mathscr{Q} = \langle \rho_\eta : \eta \in {}^\lambda 2\rangle$ such that

- $(a)'$ $\rho_\eta \in {}^\lambda 2$
- $(b)'$ $\eta_1 \ne \eta_2 \in {}^\lambda 2 \Rightarrow \rho_{\eta_2} \ne \rho_{\eta_2}$
- $(c)'$ if $\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in {}^\lambda 2$ are distinct and if $\eta_1 \cap \eta_2 \triangleleft \eta_1 \cap \eta_0$ (so $\eta_1 \cap \eta_2 \ne \eta_1 \cap \eta_0$) then $\rho_{\eta_1} \cap \rho_{\eta_2} \triangleleft \rho_{\eta_1} \cap \rho_{\eta_0}$ and $\rho_{\eta_1}(\ell g(\rho_{\eta_1} \cap \rho_{\eta_2})) = \eta_1(\ell g(\eta_1 \cap \eta_2))$.

Note

0.5 Fact. 1) If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$ and E is $\mathscr{L}$(induction)-nice then E is $L_{\lambda^+,\kappa}$-nice.

§1

We here continue [Sh 664, §2], the theorem and most proofs can be read without it. The claims below generalize [Sh 273].

1.1 Claim. *Assume*

$\boxtimes_1(a)$ $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ *and* $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$ *or just* $(Dl)_\lambda$ *(see 0.3)*

(b) *E is a nice 2-place relation on λ*

$(c)(\alpha)$ *E is a equivalence relation on ${}^\lambda 2$*

(β) *if $\eta, \nu \in {}^\lambda 2$ and $(\exists! \alpha < \lambda)(\eta(\alpha) \neq \nu(\alpha))$ then $\neg \eta E \nu$.*

Then E has 2^λ equivalence classes, moreover a perfect set of pairwise non E-equivalent members of ${}^\lambda 2$.

Proof. Note that

> $\circledast$ of $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ-complete forcing (or just λ-strategically complete) then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "clauses (c), $(\alpha), (\beta)$ are still true".
> So we can apply 1.2 below. $\square_{1.1}$

A relative is

1.2 Claim. *Assume*

$\boxtimes_2(a), (c)$ *as in* $\boxtimes_1$

(b) *is $\pi^1_1[\lambda]$ 2-place relation on ${}^\lambda 2$, say defined by $(\exists z)\varphi(x, y, z, \bar{a})$ see Definition 0.2*

$(c)^+ = (c)^+_{\rm Cohen}$ *if $\mathbb{P} = ({}^{\lambda >}2, \triangleleft)$, i.e. λ-Cohen then in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$ clauses (c) still hold.*

Proof. Stage A: Let $(\eta_0, \eta_1) \in {}^\lambda 2 \times {}^\lambda 2$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$ for the forcing $\mathbb{Q} = ({}^{\lambda >}2) \times ({}^{\lambda >}2)$. Now do we have $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1] \models$ "$\eta_0 E \eta_1$"? If so, then for some $(p_0, p_1) \in ({}^{\lambda >}2) \times ({}^{\lambda >}2)$ we have $(p_0, p_1) \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1$", let $\alpha < \lambda$ be $> \ell g(p_0), \ell g(p_1)$ and by clause $(c)^+(\beta)$ in $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1]$ we can find $\eta'_1 \in {}^\lambda 2$ such that $\eta^1_1 \restriction \alpha = \eta_1 \restriction \alpha$, and for some $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda), \eta'_1 \restriction [\beta, \lambda) = \eta_1 \restriction [\beta, \lambda)$, (here $\beta = \alpha + 1$ is O.K.) and $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1] \models \neg \eta'_1 E \eta_1$.

So $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1] \models$ "$\neg \eta_0 E \eta'_1$" (again as in $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1], E$ is an equivalence relation by clause $(c)^+$ and $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1] \models$ "$\eta_0 E \eta_1$"). Also (η_0, η'_1) is generic over $\mathbf{V}$ for

$({}^{\lambda>}2) \times ({}^{\lambda>}2)$ with (p_0, p_1) in the generic set and $\mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta_1] = \mathbf{V}[\eta_0, \eta'_1]$ so we get a contradiction to $(p_0, p_1) \Vdash$ "$\neg \underset{\sim}{\eta}_0 \in \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1$". Hence

$\circledast_1$ $\Vdash_{({}^{\lambda>}2)\times({}^{\lambda>}2)}$ "$\neg(\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1)$".

Stage B:

Let χ be large enough and let $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ be such that $\|N\| = \lambda, N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N$ and the definition of E belongs to N. Note that

$\circledast_2$ if $(\eta_0, \eta_1) \in ({}^{\lambda}2) \times ({}^{\lambda}2)$ (and is in $\mathbf{V}$) and $N[\eta_0, \eta_1] \models$ "$\neg \eta_0 E \eta_1$", then $\neg \eta_0 E \eta_1$.
[Why? As E is π^1_1, in $N[\eta_0, \eta_1]$ there is a witness $\in {}^{\lambda}2$ for failure, and it also witnesses in $\mathbf{V}$ that $\neg \eta_0 E \eta_1$.]

Clearly to finish proving 1.1, it suffices to prove

1.3 Subclaim. *1) Assume $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $(Dl)_\lambda$.*

If $\mathscr{H}(\lambda) \subseteq N, N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N, \|N\| = \lambda$ and $N \models ZFC^-$, then there is a perfect $\mathscr{Q} \subseteq {}^{\lambda>}2$ such that for any $\eta_0 \neq \eta_1$ from $\mathscr{Q}$ the pair (η_0, η_1) is generic over N for $[({}^{\lambda}2) \times ({}^{\lambda>}2)]^N$.
2) Assume $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and there is a tree with λ levels each of cardinality $< \lambda$ and 2^λ λ-branches. Then for some $X \subseteq {}^{\lambda}2, |X| = 2^\lambda$ and $\eta_0 \neq \eta_1 \in X \Rightarrow (\eta_0, \eta_1)$ generic over N for $({}^{\lambda>}2) \times ({}^{\lambda>}2)$.

Proof. 1) Let $\langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be such that $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\alpha), |\mathscr{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$, and for every $X \subseteq \lambda$ the set $\{\alpha : X \cap \alpha \in \mathscr{P}_\alpha\}$ is stationary. So by coding we can find $\mathscr{P}'_\alpha \subseteq \{(\eta_0, \eta_1) : \eta_0, \eta_1 \in {}^{\alpha}2\}$ of cardinality $< \lambda$ such that for every $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in {}^{\lambda}2$ the set $\{\alpha < \lambda : (\eta_0 \restriction \alpha, \eta_1 \restriction \alpha) \in \mathscr{P}'_\alpha\}$ is stationary. Lastly, let $\langle \mathscr{I}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ list the dense open subsets of $({}^{\lambda>}2) \times ({}^{\lambda>}2)$ which belongs to N. Now we define by induction on $\alpha < \lambda, \langle \rho_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\alpha}2 \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $\rho_\eta \in {}^{\lambda>}2$
- (b) $\beta < \ell g(\eta) \Rightarrow \rho_{\eta \restriction \beta} \triangleleft \rho_\eta$
- (c) $\rho_\eta{}^\frown \langle \ell \rangle \triangleleft \rho_{\eta^\frown \langle \ell \rangle}$
- (d) if $(\eta_0, \eta_1) \in \mathscr{P}'_\alpha, \ell_0 < 2, \ell_1 < 2$ then $(\rho_{\eta_0{}^\frown \langle \ell_0 \rangle}, \rho_{\eta_1{}^\frown \langle \ell_1 \rangle}) \in \bigcap\limits_{\beta \leq \alpha} \mathscr{I}_\beta$.

There is no problem to carry the definition (using $|\mathscr{P}'_\alpha| < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$) and $\{\bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\lambda} \rho_{\eta \restriction \alpha} : \eta \in {}^{\lambda}2\}$ is a perfect set as required.
2) Easier as we can assume that such a tree belongs to N. $\square_{1.3}, \square_{1.2}$

1.4 Claim. *1) In 1.1, 1.2 we can weaken clause* (β) *(in* $(c), (c)^+$*, call it* $(c)^-, (c)^\pm$ *respectively) to*

- $(\beta)^-$ *if* $\eta \in {}^\lambda 2, \alpha < \lambda$ *then for some* $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda)$ *and* $\rho \in {}^{[\alpha,\beta)}2$ *we have* $\neg \eta E((\eta \restriction \alpha)\hat{}\rho\hat{}\eta \restriction [\beta, \lambda))$.

2) In 1.1, 1.2 and in 1.4(1) for any $\varepsilon^* \leq \lambda$ *we can replace* E *by* $\langle E_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \rangle$*, each* E_ε *satisfying clauses (b) and* $(c), (c)^+, (c)^-, (c)^\pm$ *there respectively and in the conclusion:*

- $(*)$ *there is a* λ*-perfect* $\mathscr{Q}$ *such that*
  - (α) $\mathscr{Q} = \langle \rho_\eta : \eta \in {}^\lambda 2 \rangle$ *and*
  - (β) *if* $\eta_1 \neq \eta_2$ *are from* ${}^\lambda 2$ *then* $\rho_{\eta_1} \neq \rho_{\eta_2}$ *and* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \Rightarrow \neg(\rho_{\eta_1} E_\beta \rho_{\eta_2})$
  - (γ) *for* $\eta \in {}^\lambda 2$ *the set* $\{\ell g(\rho_\eta \cap \rho_\nu) : \nu \in {}^\lambda 2 \backslash \{\eta\}\}$ *is a closed unbounded subset of* λ.

3) In 1.2, 1.4(1),(2) we can weaken $(c)^+$ *or* $(c)^\pm$ *to*

- $(*)$ *for a stationary set of* $N \in [\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)]^\lambda$ *there is (in* $\mathbf{V}$*)* $\eta \in {}^\lambda 2$ *which is Cohen over* N *such that* $\pi^1_1[\lambda]$ *sentences are absolute from* $N[\eta]$ *to* $\mathbf{V}$ *(for* $\Sigma^1_1[\lambda]$ *sentences this is necessarily true and clause (c) (or* $(c)^-$*) holds.*

Proof. The same as the proof of 1.1.

Now we would like not to restrict ourselves to $\pi^1_1[\lambda]$ equivalence relations.

1.5 Claim. *1) Assume*

- *(a)* $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}, \mu \leq 2^\lambda$
- *(b)* E *is a* $\pi^1_2[\lambda]$ *2-place relation on* ${}^\lambda 2$*, say definable by* $(\forall z_1)(\exists z_2)\varphi(x, y, z_1, z_2, a)$
- *(c)*(α) E *is an equivalence relation on* ${}^\lambda 2$
  - (β) *if* $\eta, \nu \in {}^\lambda 2$ *and* $(\exists! \alpha < \lambda)(\eta(\alpha)) \neq \nu(\alpha))$ *then* $\neg(\eta E \nu)$

- $(c)^+$ *if* $\eta \in {}^\lambda 2$ *is generic over* $\mathbf{V}$ *for* $({}^{\lambda >}2, \triangleleft)$*, i.e. is Cohen* *then* *in* $\mathbf{V}[\eta]$*, clause (c) still holds*
  (note that for $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in ({}^\lambda 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ *anyhow* $\mathbf{V} \models$ "$\rho_1 E \rho_2$" $\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{V}[\eta] \models$ "$\rho_1 E \rho_2$"*)*
- *(d) for every* $A \subseteq \lambda$ *and* $\chi > 2^\lambda$ *there are* $N, \langle \rho_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ *such that*
  - *(i)* $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in), N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N, \|N\| = \lambda, A \in N$

(*ii*) $\rho_\varepsilon \in {}^{\lambda}2$ *and* $[\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow \rho_\varepsilon \neq \rho_\varepsilon]$

(*iii*) *for* $\varepsilon \neq \zeta, (\rho_\varepsilon, \rho_\zeta)$ *is generic over* N *for* $({}^{\lambda>}2 \times {}^{\lambda>}2)$

(*iv*) $\pi^1_1[\lambda]$ *formulas are preserved from* $N[\rho_\varepsilon, \rho_\zeta]$ *to* $\mathbf{V}$ *for* $\varepsilon < \zeta < \mu$.

Then E *has* $\geq \mu$ *equivalence classes.*
2) We can replace $\geq \mu$ *by "perfect" in the conclusion if in (c),* $\{\rho_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\} \subseteq {}^{\lambda}2$ *is perfect [see 0.4].*
3) We can replace ${}^{\lambda>}2$ *by* $\mathscr{T} \subseteq {}^{\lambda>}2$ *subtree such that forcing with* $\mathscr{T}$ *adds no bounded subset to* λ.

Proof. By [Sh 664, 2.2t].

1.6 Definition. Clause (d) of 1.5 is called "λ is $[\lambda, \mu)$-w.c.a." (as in [Sh 664, 2.1t]'s notation).

1.7 Claim. *We can strengthen 1.5 just as 1.4 strenghthens 1.1.*

We may wonder when does clause (d) of 1.5 holds.

1.8 Claim. *1) Assume*

(*i*) $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ *in* $\mathbf{V}$

(*ii*) $\mathbb{P}$ *is a forcing notion*

(*iii*) $\langle \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ *is a sequence of* $\mathbb{P}$*-names,*

(*iv*) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\zeta \neq \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\varepsilon \in {}^{\lambda}2$ *for* $\varepsilon < \zeta < \mu$"

(*v*) *if* $A \subseteq \lambda, p \in \mathbb{P}, \chi$ *large enough then there are* $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in), \|N\| = \lambda, N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N, \{A, p\} \in N$ *and* q *such that* $p \leq q \in \mathbb{P}, q$ *is* $(N, \mathbb{P})$*-generic,* $q \Vdash$ "$({}^{\lambda>}2)^{V^{\mathbb{P}}} \subseteq N[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}]$" *and* $\mathbb{P}' \lessdot \mathbb{P}$ *such that* $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "*for some* $u \in [\mu]^\mu$*, for every* $\varepsilon \neq \zeta$ *from* $u, (\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\varepsilon, \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\zeta)$ *is generic over* $N[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}'}]$ *for* $({}^{\lambda>}2 \times {}^{\lambda>}2)^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}$ *and the forcing* $\mathbb{P}/(\mathbb{P} + \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\varepsilon + \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\zeta)$ *is* λ*-complete (or at least* λ*-strategically complete).*

Then λ *is* (λ, μ)*-c.w.a. (see 1.6) in the universe* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$.

Proof. Straightforward.

§2 Singulars of uncountable cofinality

In this section we show that usually generalization of 0.1 probably fail badly for ${}^{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}\lambda$, λ singular of uncountable cofinality.

2.1 Claim. *1) For every λ strong limit singular we can find a very nice equivalence relation E on ${}^\lambda 2$ such that:*

- (a) *E has exactly two equivalence classes*
- (b) *if $\eta,\nu \in {}^\lambda 2$ and $(\exists! i)(\eta(i) \neq \nu(i))$, then $\neg(\eta E \nu)$.*

2) For every finite abelian group H and $a_\alpha \in H$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, we can find a very nice equivalence relation E on ${}^\lambda 2$ with $|H|$-equivalence classes such that the E-equivalence classes can be listed as $\langle X_b : b \in H\rangle$ and

- (c) *if $\eta_0,\eta_1 \in {}^\lambda 2, \eta_0(i) = 0, \eta_1(i) = 1, (\forall j)[j \neq i \Rightarrow \eta(j) = \nu(j)]$ and $\eta_\ell \in X_{b_\ell}$ then $H \models$ "$b_1 - b_0 = a_i$".*

2.2 Remark. 1) In part (2) we can look at ${}^\lambda H$ getting a similar result.

Proof. Use [Sh 664, §2].

2.3 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\lambda > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$
- (b) $2^\kappa + \lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$.

Then *there is E such that*

- (α) *E is an equivalence relation on ${}^\kappa\lambda$*
- (β) *E is very nice (see Definition 0.2)*
- (γ) *if $\eta_1,\eta_2 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and $(\forall^* i < \kappa)(\eta_1(i) = \eta_2(i))$ then $\eta_1 E \eta_2 \Leftrightarrow \eta_1 = \eta_2$*
- (δ) *E has exactly λ equivalence classes.*

2.4 Observation. In 2.3, and in the rest of this section: (of course, we have to translate the results we leave it as an exercise to the reader).
1) We can restrict ourselves to $\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i, \lambda_i < \lambda = \sum\limits_{j<\kappa} \lambda_j$, see the proof.
2) We can consider ${}^\kappa\lambda$ as a subset of ${}^\lambda 2$, in fact a very nice one:

we identify $\eta \in {}^{\kappa}\lambda$ with $\nu_\eta \in {}^{\kappa}2$ when $\nu_\eta(i) = 1 \Leftrightarrow i \in \{\text{pr}(\zeta, \eta(\zeta)) : \zeta < \kappa\}$ for any choice of a pairing function pr, in fact, any one to one pr:$\kappa \times \lambda \to \lambda$ is O.K.
3) If λ is strong limit we can identify $\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ with ${}^{\lambda}2$ as follows: without loss of generality $\lambda_i = 2^{\mu_i}$ with μ_i increasing, let $\langle g^i_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < {}^{\mu_i}2\rangle$ list the functions from $[\bigcup\limits_{j<i} \mu_j, \mu_i)$ to $\{0,1\}$ and we identify $\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ with $\bigcup\limits_{i<\kappa} g^i_{\eta(i)} \in {}^{\lambda}2$.
4) We can identify any $\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ with ${}^{\kappa}\lambda$ when $\lambda_i \le \lambda = \sum\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i = \text{ lim sup}\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ by identifying $\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ with $\nu_\eta \in {}^{\kappa}\lambda$ such that $1 + \nu_\eta(\varepsilon) = \eta(\zeta)$ when $\eta(\zeta) > 0, \varepsilon = \text{ otp}\{\xi < \zeta : \eta(\xi) > 0\}$.

Proof. We choose $\bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa\rangle$, nondecreasing $i < j \Rightarrow \lambda_i \le \lambda_j$ with limit λ, (e.g. $\lambda_i = \lambda$) let $\mu_j = \prod\limits_{i<j} \lambda_i$ so $\mu_j \le \lambda$ and let $\bar f^i = \langle f^i_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_i\rangle$ list $\prod\limits_{j<i} \lambda_j$ or just a set of representatives of $\prod\limits_{j<i} \lambda_j / J^{bd}_i$.
For every $\eta \in {}^{\kappa}\lambda$ let

- (a) for limit $i < \kappa$ let $\alpha_i(\eta) = \text{ Min}\{\alpha : \eta \restriction i = f^i_\alpha \text{ mod } J^{bd}_i\}$
- (b) for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ let $B_\varepsilon(\eta) = \{i : i < \kappa$ is a limit ordinal, $\varepsilon < i$ and $f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta)}(\varepsilon) = \eta(\varepsilon)\}$ and lastly
- (c) $A(\eta) = \{\varepsilon < \kappa : B_\varepsilon(\eta)$ is not stationary$\}$.

Now we define two binary relations E_0, E_1 on ${}^{\kappa}\lambda$:

- (d) $\eta_1 E_0 \eta_2$ iff for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$ we have $B_\varepsilon(\eta_1) = B_\varepsilon(\eta_2) \text{ mod } \mathscr{D}_\kappa$, where $\mathscr{D}_\kappa$ is the club filter on κ
- (e) $\eta_1 E_1 \eta_2$ iff $\eta_1 E_0 \eta_2$ & $\eta_1 \restriction A(\eta_1) = \eta_2 \restriction A(\eta_2)$.

Clearly

- (α) E_0 is an equivalence relation on ${}^{\kappa}\lambda$ with $\le 2^\kappa < \lambda$ classes
- (β) E_1 is an equivalence relation on ${}^{\kappa}\lambda$, refining E_0
- (γ) E_0, E_1 are very nice
- (δ) if $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in {}^{\kappa}\lambda$ and $\eta_1 E_0 \eta_2$ then $A(\eta_1) = A(\eta_2)$
- (ε) for $\eta \in {}^{\kappa}\lambda, A(\eta_1)$ is a bounded subset of κ
[why? otherwise let $C = \{\delta < \kappa : \delta = \sup(A(\eta_1) \cap \delta)\}$, it is a club of κ, and

for each $i \in C$ there is $j_i < i$ such that $\eta \restriction [j_i, i) = f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta)} \restriction [j_i, i)$, clearly j_i exists by the defintion of $\alpha_i(\eta)$. By Fodor lemma, for some $j(*) < \kappa$ the set $S_{j(*)} = \{i \in C : j_i = j(*)\}$ is stationary, now choose $\varepsilon \in A(\eta) \backslash j(*)$, so clearly $B_\varepsilon(\eta)$ includes $S_{j(*)}$ hence is a stationry subset of κ hence by the definition of $A(\eta)$ clearly ε does not belong to $A(\eta)$, contradiction.]

So clearly

(ζ) E_1 has $\le ({}^\kappa\lambda/E_0) + \Sigma\{\prod\limits_{j<i} \lambda_j : i < \kappa\} \le \lambda$ equivalence class.

Now

(η) if $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and $\eta_1 = \eta_2 \mod J^{bd}_\kappa$ then for every limit $i < \kappa$ large enough we have $\alpha_i(\eta_1) = \alpha_i(\eta_2)$

[why? let $i^* = \sup\{j + 1 : \eta_1(j) \ne \eta_2(j)\}$ so by the assumption, if i limit & $i \in (i^*, \kappa)$ then $\eta_1 \restriction i = \eta_1 \restriction i \mod J^{bd}_i$ hence $\alpha_i(\eta_1) = \alpha_i(\eta_2)$ by the definition of $\alpha_i(-)$, which is the desired conclusion of (η).]

(θ) if $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and $\eta_1 = \eta_2 \mod J^{bd}_\kappa$ then $\eta_1 E_1 \eta_2 \Leftrightarrow \eta_1 = \eta_2$

[why? if $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ clearly $\eta_1 E_1 \eta_2$; so assume $\eta_1 E_1 \eta_2$ and we shall show that $\eta_1 = \eta_2$, i.e. $\varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow \eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$. By the definition of E_1 we have $\eta_1 E_0 \eta_2$ hence by clause (δ) we have $A(\eta_1) = A(\eta_2)$, call it A. If $\varepsilon \in A$, by the definition of E_1 we have $\eta_1 \restriction A = \eta_2 \restriction A$ hence $\eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$. So assume $\varepsilon \in \kappa \backslash A$, first we can find $j^* < \kappa$ such that for every limit $i \in (j^*, \kappa)$ we have $\alpha_i(\eta_1) = \alpha_i(\eta_2)$, it exists by clause (η). Second, then $B_\varepsilon(\eta_1), B_\varepsilon(\eta_2)$ are stationary (as $\varepsilon \notin A(\eta_\ell)$) and equal modulo $\mathscr{D}_\kappa$ (as $\eta_1 E_0 \eta_2$); so we can find $i \in B_\varepsilon(\eta_1) \cap B_\varepsilon(\eta_2)$ which satisfy $i > j^*$. Now $\eta_1(\varepsilon) = f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta_1)}(\varepsilon)$ by the definition of $B_\varepsilon(\eta_1)$ as $i \in B_\varepsilon(\eta_1)$ and $\alpha_i(\eta_1) = \alpha_i(\eta_2)$ as $i > j^*$ and $f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta_2)}(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$ by the definition of $B_\varepsilon(\eta_2)$ as $i \in B_\varepsilon(\eta_1)$; together $\eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$. So we have completed the proof that $\varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow \eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$ thus proving $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ as required.]

(ι) E_1 has $\ge \lambda_i$ equivalence classes for any $i < \kappa$

[why? let $\eta^* \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and for $\alpha < \lambda_i$ let $\eta^*_\alpha \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ be defined by $\eta^*_\alpha(\varepsilon)$ is α if $\varepsilon = i$ and is $\eta^*(\varepsilon)$ otherwise. By clause (θ) we have $\alpha < \beta < \lambda_i \Rightarrow \neg \eta^*_\alpha E_1 \eta^*_\beta$, hence $|{}^\kappa\lambda/E_1| \ge \lambda_i$.]

(κ) E_1 has exactly λ equivalence classes

[why? by clause $(\iota), E_1$ has $\ge \sup\{\lambda_i : i < \kappa\} = \lambda$ equivalence classes and by clause (ζ) has $\le \lambda$ equivalence classes.] $\square_{2.3}$

2.5 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda > \kappa = cf(\lambda) > \aleph_0$

(b) $2^\kappa + \lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$

(c) $\lambda \le \theta \le \lambda^\kappa$.

Then *there is* E *such that*

- (α) E *is an equivalence relation on* ${}^\kappa\lambda$
- (β) E *is very nice*
- (γ) *if* $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ *and* $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ *mod* J^{bd}_κ *then* $\eta_1 E \eta_2 \Leftrightarrow \eta_1 = \eta_2$
- (δ) E *has* θ *equivalence classes.*

Proof. We can find a tree $\mathscr{T} \subseteq {}^\kappa\lambda$ with λ nodes and exactly θ κ-branches ([Sh 262]); we can easily manage that $\eta \ne \nu \in \lim_\kappa(\mathscr{T}) \Rightarrow (\exists^\kappa i < \kappa)(\eta(i)) \ne \nu(i))$. We proceed as in the proof of 2.3, but in the definition of E_1 we add

$$\eta_1 \in \lim_\kappa(T) \equiv \eta_2 \in \lim_\kappa(\mathscr{T}) \;\;\&\;\; (\eta_1 \in \lim_\kappa(\mathscr{T}) \rightarrow \eta_1 = \eta_2).$$

$\square_{2.5}$

2.6 Claim. *In Claim 2.3 we replace clause* (γ) *by*

- $(\gamma)_1$ *for every* $\eta^* \in {}^\kappa\lambda$, *the set* $\{\eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda : \eta = \eta^*$ *mod* $J^{bd}_\kappa\}$ *is a set of representatives for the family of* E*-equivalence classes.*

Proof. Let $\bar\lambda$ be as there.

Let K_i be an additive group, with set of elements λ_i and zero 0_{K_i}. Let $<^*$ be a well ordering of ${}^\kappa(\mathscr{P}(\kappa))$.

For every $\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ let

$$\Xi_\eta = \{\langle B_\varepsilon(\nu) : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle : \nu \in \prod_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i \text{ and } \nu = \eta \text{ mod } J^{bd}_\kappa\}$$

so it is a nonempty subset of ${}^\kappa(\mathscr{P}(\kappa))$ and let $\bar B^*_\eta$ be its $<^*$-first member and let $\Theta_\eta = \{\nu \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i : B_\varepsilon(\nu) = B^*_{\eta,\varepsilon}$ for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$ and $\nu = \eta$ mod $J^{\rm bd}_\kappa\}$.

Now note

- $(*)_0$ $\Theta_\eta \ne \emptyset$ so $\bar B^*_\eta$ is well defined for $\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$
- $(*)_1$ if $\nu \in \Theta_\eta$ then for every limit $i < \kappa$ large enough we have $\alpha_i(\nu) = \alpha_i(\eta)$
- $(*)_2$ if $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Theta$ and $\varepsilon < \kappa$, then for every limit i large enough we have: $f^i_{\alpha_i(\nu_1)}(\varepsilon) = f^i_{\alpha_i(\nu_2)}(\varepsilon)$.

Now for $\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ we define $\rho_\eta \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ by

$$\rho_\eta(\varepsilon) \text{ is :} f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta)}(\varepsilon) \text{ for every } i \in B^*_\varepsilon$$
$$\text{large enough if } B^*_{\eta,\varepsilon} \text{ is stationary}$$

$$0_{K_i} \text{ if } B^*_\varepsilon \text{ is not stationary.}$$

It is easy to see that

$(*)_3$ if $\nu \in \kappa_\lambda$ then $\rho_\eta(\varepsilon) = \eta(\varepsilon)$ for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$ large enough hence

$(*)_4$ $\rho_\eta = \eta \bmod J^{bd}_\kappa$

$(*)_5$ if $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ and $\eta_1 = \eta_2 \bmod J^{bd}_\kappa$ then $\rho_{\eta_1} = \rho_{\eta_2}$.

Lastly, we define the equivalence relation E:
for $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i$ we define:

$$\eta_1 E \eta_2 \ \underline{\text{iff}} \ (\text{for every } i < \kappa \text{ we have } K_i \models \text{“}\eta_1(i) - \rho_{\eta_1}(i) = \eta_2(i) - \rho_{\eta_2}(i)\text{”}).$$

Now check. $\square_{2.6}$

We may like to weaken the cardinal arithmetic assumptions.

2.7 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda > \kappa = cf(\lambda) > \aleph_0$

(b) $\kappa^{\aleph_0} < \lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$.

Then the results 2.3, 2.6 and 2.5 (if there is a tree $\mathscr{T}$ with λ nodes and κ-branches) holds if we replace the ideal J^{bd}_κ by the ideal $[\kappa]^{<\aleph_0}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality $\lambda_i > \kappa^{\aleph_0}$, $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ as in 2.3. Let $\langle D_i : i < \kappa^{\aleph_0} \rangle$ list the subsets of κ of order type ω and let $\bar f^i = \langle f^i_\alpha : \alpha < \prod\limits_{j \in D_i} \lambda_j \rangle$ list $\prod\limits_{j \in D_i} \lambda_j$. For $\eta \in \prod\limits_{\varepsilon<\kappa} \lambda_\varepsilon$ let $\alpha_i(\eta) = \text{Min}\{\alpha : \eta \restriction D_i = f^i_\alpha \bmod J^{bd}_{D_i}\}$. With those choices the proofs are similar, we write below the proof of the parallel of 2.3.

Define a two place relation E^* on $\prod\limits_{\varepsilon<\kappa} \lambda_\varepsilon : \eta E \nu$ iff $(\forall i < \kappa^{\aleph_0})(\alpha_i(\eta) = \alpha_i(\nu))$. Clearly E^* is a very nice equivalence relation and $\eta E^* \nu$ iff ($\eta, \nu \in \prod\limits_{\varepsilon<\kappa} \lambda_\varepsilon$ and $\{\varepsilon : \eta(\varepsilon) \neq \nu(\varepsilon)\}$ is finite). For $\eta \in \prod\limits_{\varepsilon<\kappa} \lambda_\varepsilon$ let $A_{\eta,\varepsilon} = \{f^i_{\alpha_i(\eta)}(\varepsilon) : i < \kappa^{\aleph_0}$ and $\varepsilon \in D_i\}$ and let $\gamma_{\eta,\varepsilon}$ be 0 if $\eta(\varepsilon) \in A_{\eta,\varepsilon}$ and $\eta(\varepsilon) - \sup(A_{\eta,\varepsilon} \cap \eta(\varepsilon))$ otherwise stipulating $\alpha - \beta = 0$ if $\alpha \leq \beta$. Lastly, $\eta E \nu$ iff $(\forall \varepsilon)(\gamma_{\eta,\varepsilon} \equiv \gamma_{\nu,\varepsilon})$. $\Box_{2.7}$

2.8 Claim. *1) If $2^\kappa < \lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}, \aleph_0 < \kappa =$ cf$(\lambda) < \lambda$, then we can find E as in 2.3$(\alpha), (\beta)$ (but not (γ)) and*

- *$(\gamma)^*$ if $\eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and $i < \kappa$ then $X_{\alpha,i} = \{\nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda : (\forall j)(j < \kappa \ \& \ j \neq i \rightarrow \nu(j) = \eta(j)\}$ is a set of representations for E.*

2) If $2^\kappa \leq \lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}, \aleph_0 < \kappa =$ cf$(\lambda) < \lambda, 1 \leq \theta \leq \lambda$, then we can find E as in 2.3$(\alpha), (\beta)$ and

- *$(\gamma)^*$ if $\eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ and $i < \kappa$ then $X_{\alpha,i}$ contains a set of representations*
- *$(\delta)^*$ E has θ equivalence classes.*

Proof. 1) We let K be an abelian group with universe λ and in the proof of 2.6, define ρ_η such that $\eta = \rho_\eta \bmod [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0}$ and let $a_\eta = \{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \neq \rho_\eta(i)\} \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0}$ and define E by: $\eta E \nu$ iff $K \models \sum\limits_{i \in a_\eta} \eta(i) - \rho_\eta(i) = \sum\limits_{i \in a_\nu} \nu(i) - \rho_\nu(i)$.
2) Similar but we use equality in $K/K_1, K_1$ a subgroup of K such that $(K : K_1) = \theta$. $\Box_{3.5}$

2.9 Concluding Remark. Instead $\langle J^{bd}_{D_i} : i < \kappa^{\aleph_0}\rangle$ we can use $\langle (D_i, J_i) : i < i^{\bar{\lambda}}\rangle, D_i \subseteq \kappa, J_i$ an ideal on D_i such that $|\prod\limits_{\varepsilon \in D_i} \lambda_\varepsilon / J_i| \leq \lambda, I = \{D \subseteq \kappa$: for every $i < i^*$ we have $D \cap D_i \in J_i\}$ is included in J^{bd}_κ.
Have not pursued this.

§3 Countable cofinality: positive results

We first phrase sufficient conditions which related to large cardinals. Then we prove that they suffice. The proof of 3.1 is later in this section.

3.1 Lemma. *Assume*

(a) *λ is strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0$*

(b) *λ is a limit of measurables, or just*

$(b)^-$ *for every $\theta < \lambda$ for some μ, χ satisfying $\theta \leq \mu \leq \chi < \lambda$, there is a (χ, μ, θ)-witness (see Definition 3.2 below)*

(c) *E is a nice equivalence relation on ${}^{\omega}\lambda$ (or has enough absoluteness, as proved in 3.11)*

(d) *if $\eta, \nu \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$ and $(\exists ! n)(\eta(n) \neq \nu(n))$ then $\neg(\eta E \nu)$.*

Then E has 2^λ equivalence classes, moreover if $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \lambda = \Sigma_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ then there is a subtree of ${}^{\omega>}\lambda$ isomorphic to $\bigcup\limits_{m} \prod\limits_{n<m} \lambda_n$, with the ω-branches pairwise non E-equivalent (even somewhat more, see 3.15).

3.2 Definition. 1) We say $(\mathbb{Q}, I_2^{s_1,s_2})$ is a (λ, μ, θ)-witness if $(\lambda \geq \mu \geq \theta$ and):

(a) $\mathbb{Q}$ is a θ-complete forcing notion

(b) s_1 is a function from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathscr{P}(\lambda) \backslash \{\emptyset\}$

(c) s_2 is a function from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\{A : A \subseteq \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta < \lambda\}\}$

(d) if $\mathbb{Q} \models p \leq q$ then $s_\ell(q) \subseteq s_\ell(p)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$

(e) $(\alpha, \beta) \in s_2(p) \Rightarrow \{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq s_1(p)$

(f) for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ there is q such that $p \leq q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $(\forall \beta)(\exists \alpha, \gamma)[\beta \in s_1(q) \rightarrow (\alpha, \beta) \in s_2(p) \ \& \ (\beta, \gamma) \in s_2(p)]$

(g) if $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $A \subseteq \lambda \times \lambda$, then for some q we have $p \leq q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $s_2(p) \subseteq A \vee s_2(p) \cap A = \emptyset$

(h) if $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ then for some $Y \in [\lambda]^\mu$ for every $\alpha < \beta$ from Y we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in s_2(p)$.

2) We say $(\mathbb{Q}, s_1, s_2)$ is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \varrho)$-witness if we can strengthen clause (g) to

$(g)^+$ if $f : {}^2\lambda \rightarrow \varrho$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ then for some q we have $p \leq q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $f \restriction s_2(q)$ is constant.

3) We call $(\mathbb{Q}, s_1, s_2)$ uniform if $\lambda =: \cup\{s_1(p) : p \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ is a cardinal and for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\alpha < \lambda$ for some q we have $p \le q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $s_1(q) \cap \alpha = \emptyset$.
4) We replace ϱ by $< \varrho$ if in clause $(g)^+$, $\text{Rang}(f)$ is a subset of ϱ of cardinality $< \varrho$.

3.3 Definition. 1) We say that $(\mathbb{Q}, \bar{s})$ is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \varrho; n)$-witness if $\lambda \ge \mu \ge \theta, \lambda \ge \varrho$ and $\bar{s} = \langle s_m : m = 1, \dots, n\rangle$ and

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}$ is a θ-complete forcing
- (b) s_m is a function from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathscr{P}(\{\bar{\alpha} : \bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < m\rangle, \alpha_\ell < \alpha_{\ell+1}$ for $\ell < m-1\})$
- (c) if $\mathbb{Q} \models p \le q$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ then $s_m(p) \subseteq s_m(q)$
- (d) if $\langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < m+1\rangle \in s_{m+1}(p)$ and $k < m+1$ then $\langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < k\rangle\hat{\ }\langle \alpha_\ell : \ell = k+1, \dots, m\rangle \in s_m(p)$
- (e) for every $m \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, k < m$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ there is q satisfying $p \le q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $(\forall \bar{\alpha} \in s_m(q))(\exists \bar{\beta} \in s_{m+1}(p))[\bar{\alpha} = (\bar{\beta} \restriction k)\hat{\ }(\bar{\beta} \restriction [k+1, m))]$
- $(f)^+$ if $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $f : {}^m\lambda \to \varrho$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ then for some q we have $p \le q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $f \restriction s_m(q)$ is constant
- (g) if $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ then for some $Y \in [\lambda]^\mu$ every increasing $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^nY$ belongs to $s_n(p)$.

2) $(\mathbb{Q}, \bar{s})$ is a $(\lambda, \theta, \varrho; \omega)$-witness is defined similarly (using s_m for $m \in [1, \omega)$).
3) If $\varrho = 2$ we may omit it, also in Definition 3.2. Also "uniform" and "$< \varrho$" means as in Definition 3.2.

3.4 Claim. *1) If $(\mathbb{Q}, s_1, s_2)$ is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta; n)$-witness and $\varrho < \theta, n < \omega$, then $(\mathbb{Q}, s_1, s_2)$ is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta, 2^\varrho; n)$-witness.*
2) If $\mathscr{D}$ is a normal ultrafilter on λ so λ is measurable, $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathscr{D}, \supseteq), s_1(A) = A, s_2(A) = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta$ are from $A\}$, then (Q, s_1, s_2) is a uniform $(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda)$-witness.
3) If in (2), $s_m(A) = \{\bar{\alpha} : \bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < m\rangle$ is increasing, $\alpha_\ell \in A\}, \bar{s} = \langle s_{m+1} : m < n\rangle$ and $n \le \omega$ then $(\mathbb{Q}, \bar{s})$ is a $(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, < \lambda; n)$-witness.
4) If there is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta; n)$-witness and $2^{<\theta} \le \lambda$, then there is such $(\mathbb{Q}, \bar{s})$ with $|\mathbb{Q}| \le 2^\lambda$.
5) Definition 3.2(1) is the case $n = 2$ of Definition 3.3(1).

Proof. Easy.

3.5 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $2 \le n < \omega, \lambda = \beth_{n-1}(\theta)^+$
- (b) *θ is a compact cardinal or just a λ-compact cardinal*
- (c) $\mu = \mu^{<\mu} < \theta$
- (d) $\mathbb{P} =$ *Levy*$(\mu, < \theta)$.

Then in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, there is a $(\lambda, \mu, \theta; n)$-witness $(\mathbb{Q}, \bar{s})$.
2) If there are λ_n for $n < \omega, \lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}$ and λ_n is $2^{(2^{\lambda_n})^+}$-compact, then for some set forcing $\mathbb{P}$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$ the cardinal $\lambda = \beth_\omega = \aleph_\omega$ is dichotomically good (see Definition 3.7 below).

Proof. By [Sh 124].

Toward proving Lemma 3.1 assume (till the end of this section) that

3.6 Hypothesis. $\lambda = \sum \lambda_n, \sum\limits_{\ell<n} 2^{\lambda_\ell} < \theta_n \le \lambda_n$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n, s_{n,1}, s_{n,2})$ is a $(\lambda_n, \mu_n^+, \theta_n)$-witness and for simplicity $\mu_n < \mu_{n+1}, \lambda = \sum\limits_n \mu_n$.

3.7 Definition. We call λ dichotomically good if there are $\lambda_n, \mu_n, \theta_n, \mathbb{P}_n, s_{n,1}, s_{n,2}$ as in 3.6.

3.8 Definition. 1) We define the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_1$

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \{p : p = (\eta, \bar{A}) = (\eta^p, \bar{A}^p)$ such that letting $n(p) = \ell g(\eta)$ we have $n^p < \omega, \eta^p \in \prod\limits_{\ell<n[p]} \lambda_\ell$ and $\bar{A}^p = \langle A^p_\ell : \ell \in [n(p), \omega)\rangle$ and $A^p_\ell \in \mathbb{P}_\ell\}$
- (b) $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_1} q$ iff $\eta^p \trianglelefteq \eta^q, n(p) \le \eta(q), \ell \in [n(q), \omega) \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\ell \models$ "$A^p_\ell \le A^q_\ell$" and $n(p) \le \ell < n(q) \Rightarrow \eta^q(\ell) \in s_1(A^p_\ell)$
- (c) We define the $\mathbb{Q}_1$-name $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ by: $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] = \cup\{\eta^p : p \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_1}\}$
- (d) We define
  - (α) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_1}_{pr} q$ iff $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_1} q$ & $n(p) = n(q)$
  - (β) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_1}_{apr} q$ iff $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_1} q$ & $\bigwedge\limits_{\ell \ge n(q)} A^q_\ell = A^p_\ell$
  - (γ) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_1}_{pr,n} q$ iff $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_1}_{pr} q$ and $\bar{A}^p \restriction [n(p), n(q)) = \bar{A}^q \restriction [n(p), n(q))$.

2) We define the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_2$ by:

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}_2 = \big\{p : p = (\eta_0, \eta_1, \bar{A}) = (\eta^p_0, \eta^p_1, \bar{A}^p)$ where for some $n(p) < \omega$ we have: $\eta^p_0, \eta^p_1 \in \prod\limits_{\ell < n[p]} \lambda_\ell, \bar{A}^p = \langle A^p_\ell : \ell \in [n(p), \omega)\rangle$ and $A^p_\ell \in \mathbb{P}_\ell\big\}$
- (b) $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_2} q$ iff
  - (i) $n(p) \le n(q)$
  - (ii) $\eta^p_\ell \trianglelefteq \eta^q_\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1$
  - (iii) $A^q_\ell \subseteq A^p_\ell$ for $\ell \in [n(q), \omega)$
  - (iv) the pair $(\eta^p_0(\ell), \eta^p_1(\ell))$ is from $s_2(A^p_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [n(p), n(q))$
- (c) we define[1] the $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\ell$ (for $\ell = 0, 1$) by $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\ell[G] = \cup\{\eta^p_\ell : p \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_2}\}$
- (d) we define
  - (α) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_2}_{pr} q$ iff $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_1} q$ & $n(p) = n(q)$ and
  - (β) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_2}_{apr} q$ iff $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_2} q$ & $\bigwedge\limits_{\ell \ge n(q)} A^q_\ell = A^p_\ell$ and
  - (γ) $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_2}_{pr,n} q$ iff $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_2}_{pr} q$ and $\bar{A}^p \restriction [n(p), n) \equiv \bar{A}^q \restriction [n(p), n)$.

3) If for a fix $k < \omega$, we have $(\mathbb{P}_n, \bar{s}^n)$ is a $(\lambda_n, \mu_n, \theta_n; k)$-witness for $n < \omega$ then we can define $\mathbb{Q}_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ naturally.
4) If $(\mathbb{P}_n, \bar{s}^n)$ is a $(\lambda_n, \mu_n, \theta_n; n)$-witness for $n < \omega$ then we can define $\mathbb{Q} = \{(\eta_0, \bar{A}) : n < \omega, \eta(\ell) \in {}^{\ell}(\lambda_\ell)\}$ is increasing, $\bar{A} = \langle A_\ell : \ell \in [n, \omega), A_\ell \in \mathbb{P}_\ell\}$ with the natural order.
We shall not pursue (3), (4).

3.9 Fact. Let $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$.
1) If $p \le_{\mathbb{Q}_\ell} q$ then for some q we have $p \le^{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}_{pr,n(q)} q \le^{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}_{apr} r$.
2) If $\bar{p} = \langle p_i : i < \alpha\rangle$ is $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}_{pr}$-increasing, $\alpha < \theta_{n(p_0)}$, then $\bar{p}$ has a $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}_{pr}$-upper bound.
3) If $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_\ell$-name of an ordinal, $p \in \mathbb{Q}_\ell$, then for some q and n we have:

- (a) $p \le_{pr} q$
- (b) if $q \le_{apr} r$ and $n(r) \ge n$, then r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$.

---

[1] why don't we ask $(\forall \ell < n^p)(\eta^p_0(\ell) < \eta^p_1(\ell))$? to be able to construct the perfect set, but, of course, $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_2}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0(\ell) < \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1(\ell)$ for $\ell \in [n(p), \omega)$"

4) In (3), if $\Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} < \omega$ or just $< \alpha^* < \theta_{n(p)}$" then without loss of generality $n = n(p)$.

Proof. Easy.

3.10 Claim. *1)* $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ *is generic for* $\mathbb{Q}_1$.

2) The pair $(\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0, \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1), \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1$ *is generic for* $\mathbb{Q}_2$.

3.11 Claim. *Forcing by* $\mathbb{Q}_2$ *preserve "E is a nice (see Definition 0.2(2)) equivalence relation on* $\prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ *satisfying clause (d) of 3.1.*

Proof. Assume toward contradiction that $p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_2}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_2 \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\omega} \lambda_\ell$ form a counterexample that is: $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1 \wedge \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_2 \wedge \neg \underset{\sim}{\nu}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1$ or $\neg \underset{\sim}{\nu}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_0$ or $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1 \wedge \neg \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_0$ or $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1 \wedge (\exists! n)(\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0(n) \neq \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1(n))$".

Choose χ large enough and $\bar{N} = \langle N_n : n < \omega \rangle, N$ such that:

$\circledast^\chi_{\bar{N}}(i)$ $N_n \prec_{L_{\lambda^+_n, \lambda^+_n}} (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ and $\|N_n\| = 2^{\lambda_n}$ and $\{p^*, E, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_0, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_2, N_0, \ldots, N_{n-1}\}$ belong to N_n

(ii) $N = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} N_n$ so $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$.

Now we choose p_n by induction on $n < \omega$ such that:

$(*)(i)$ $p_0 = p$,

(ii) $p_n \in N_n, n(p_n) \geq n$

(iii) $p_n \leq p_{n+1}$

(iv) if $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in N_n$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name of an ordinal then for some $k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau}) > n+1$ we have: if $p_{n+1} \leq q$ and $n(q) \geq k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n)$ then q forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$.

This is possible by 3.9(2),(3). Now let $G = \{q : q \in N \cap \mathbb{Q}_2$ and $q \leq p_n$ (or just $p_n \Vdash$ "$q \in \underset{\sim}{G}$") for some $n\}$, it is a subset of $\mathbb{Q}^N_2$ generic over N. (Why? If $N \models$ "$\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_2$ is dense" then $\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_2$ is dense and there is $\mathscr{I}' \subseteq \mathscr{I}$, a maximal antichain of $\mathbb{Q}_2$ which belongs to N hence to some N_n; there is $g \in N_n$, a one to one function from $\mathscr{I}'$ onto $|\mathscr{I}'|$, so it define a $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name $\underset{\sim}{\tau}, \underset{\sim}{\tau}(G) = \gamma \Leftrightarrow (\forall q)(q \in \mathscr{I}' \cap G \rightarrow f(q) = \gamma) \Leftrightarrow (\exists q)(q \in \mathscr{I}' \cap G \;\&\; f(q) = \gamma)$, so $k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau}) < \omega$ is well defined and so $p_{k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau})}$ forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ hence forces $q \in \underset{\sim}{G}$ for some $q \in \mathscr{I}' \subseteq \mathscr{I}$, hence $q \in G$ so $G \cap \mathscr{I} \neq \emptyset$ as required). Now by straightforward absoluteness argument, $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_0[G], \underset{\sim}{\nu}_1[G], \underset{\sim}{\nu}_2[G] \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\omega} \lambda_\ell$ give contradiction to an assumption. $\square_{3.11}$

In fact

3.12 Observation. Assume

(*a*) λ^* is strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0, \lambda^* = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda^*_n, \lambda^*_n < \lambda^*_{n+1}$

(*b*)

- (*i*) $\mathbb{Q}$ is a forcing notion
- (*ii*) $\leq_{pr}$ is included in $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and
- (*iii*) $\mathbf{n} : \mathbb{Q} \to \omega$ is such that, for each n the set $\mathscr{I}_n = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} : \mathbf{n}(p) \geq n\}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{Q}$
- (*iv*) for $p \in \mathbb{Q}, \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : p \leq_{pr} q\}$ is $\lambda^*_{n(p)}$-complete and
- (*v*) $\mathbb{Q}$ has pure decidability for $\mathbb{Q}$-names of truth values
- (*vi*) if $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of an ordinal, then there are $m < \omega$ and q satisfying: $p \leq_{pr} q$ and $q \leq r \wedge m \leq n(r) \Rightarrow$ (r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$)

(*c*) $N, \langle N_n : n < \omega \rangle$ as above, $\{\mathbb{Q}, \leq, \leq_{pr}\} \in N_0$.

Then there is $G \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^N$ generic over N hence $\mathscr{H}(\lambda)^{N[G]} = \mathscr{H}(\lambda)$.

Proof. Should be clear.

3.13 Definition/Claim. Assume that F is a permutation of $(\prod\limits_{\ell<n(*)} \lambda_\ell) \times (\prod\limits_{\ell<n(*)} \lambda_\ell)$.

1) Let $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)} = \{p \in \mathbb{P}_2 : n(p) \geq n(*)\}$ and let $\hat{F}$ be the following function from $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$ to $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}(p) = q \text{ iff } & n(q) = n(p) \\ & (\eta^q_0 \restriction n(*), \eta^q_1 \restriction n(*)) = F((\eta^p_0 \restriction n(*), \eta^p_1 \restriction n(*))) \\ & \eta^q_0 \restriction [n(*), n(p)) = \eta^p_0 \restriction [n(*), n(p)) \\ & \eta^q_1 \restriction [n(*), n(p)) = \eta^q_1 \restriction [n(*), n(p)) \\ & \bar{A}^q = \bar{A}^p. \end{aligned}$$

2) For $p \in \mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$, $\hat{F}(p)$ is well defined $\in \mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$.
3) $\hat{F}$ is a permutation of $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$ preserving $\leq, \leq_{pr}, \leq_{pr,n}, \leq_{apr}$ (and their negations), and $F \mapsto \hat{F}$ is a group homomorphism.
4) If $G \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_2$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$ then $\hat{\mathbf{F}}(G) = \{r \in \mathbb{Q}_2$: for some $q \in G \cap \mathbb{Q}_2^{\geq n(*)}$ we have $r \leq \hat{F}(q)\}$ is a generic over $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{V}[\hat{F}(G)] = \mathbf{V}[G]$ and even $N[\hat{F}(G)] = N[G]$ if say $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in), \mathbb{Q}_2 \in N, F \in N, \lambda \subseteq N$.

Proof. Easy.

3.14 Claim.
$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_2}$ "$\neg \underset{\sim}{\eta}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1$".

Proof. If not, let $p \in \mathbb{Q}_2$ be such that $p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0 E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1$". Now by clause (f) of Definition 3.2(1), we can find p_1 such that:

- (i) $\mathbb{Q}_2 \models p \leq_{pr} p_1$
- (ii) if $n(p) \leq n < \omega$ and $\beta \in s_1(A_n^{p_1})$ then for some α, γ we have $(\alpha, \beta), (\beta, \gamma) \in s_2(A_n^p)$.

Let $G_1 \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_2$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$ such that $p_1 \in G_1$ and let $\eta_\ell = \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\ell[G_1]$ so $\mathbf{V}[G_1] \models \eta_0 E \eta_1$. By 3.11 in $\mathbf{V}[G_1], E$ is still an equivalence relation satisfying clause (d) of 3.1 and $\eta_1(n) \in s_1(A_n^{p_1})$. We can find $\alpha < \lambda_{n(p)}$ such that $\alpha^* < \eta_1(n^*)$ and $(\alpha^*, \eta_1(n^*)) \in s_2(A_{n^*}^p)$. Let us define $\eta_0' \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ by $\eta_0'(n)$ is α^* if $n = n^*$ and $\eta_0(n)$ otherwise.
Now the pairs $(\eta_0 \restriction (n(*)+1), \eta_1 \restriction (n(*)+1))$ and $(\eta_0' \restriction (n(*))+1), \eta_1 \restriction (n(*)+1))$ are from $(\prod\limits_{n \leq n(*)} \lambda_n) \times (\prod\limits_{n \leq n(*)} \lambda_n)$, so there is a permutation F of this set interchanging those two pairs and is the identity otherwise. Let $G_2 = \hat{F}(G_1)$. Now by 3.13

- $(*)_1$ G_2 is a generic subset of $\mathbb{Q}_2$ over $\mathbf{V}$
- $(*)_2$ $\mathbf{V}[G_2] = \mathbf{V}[G_1]$
- $(*)_3$ $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0[G_2] = \eta_0', \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1[G_2] = \eta_1$.

By 3.11 we have

- $(*)_4$ $\mathbf{V}[G_\ell] \models \neg \eta_0 E \eta_0'$.

As $p \le p_1 \in G_1$, by the choice of p clearly

$(*)_5$ $\mathbf{V}[G_1] \models$ "$\eta_0 E \eta_1$".

By the choice of p_1 and $(\alpha, \eta_1(n^*))$ clearly $p \le \hat{F}(p_1) \in G_2$ so

$(*)_6$ $\mathbf{V}[G_2] \models$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}'_0[G_2] E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1[G_2]$" hence $\mathbf{V}[G_\ell] \models$ "$\eta'_0 E \eta_1$".

Now $(*)_4 + (*)_5 + (*)_6$ contradict 3.11. $\square_{3.14}$

3.15 Claim. *1) Fix $\chi > \lambda$ large enough and choose $N_n \prec_{L_{\lambda_n,\lambda_n}} (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ such that $\|N_n\| = 2^{\lambda_n}, \{E, p_n : n < \omega\}, \{N_\ell : \ell < n\}$ belongs to N_n, and let $N = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} N_n$; (certainly can be done). Then we can find $\langle \rho_\nu : \nu \in \prod\limits_{\ell<n} \mu_\ell, n < \omega\rangle$ and $N, \langle N_n : n < \omega\rangle$*

- (α) $\rho_\nu \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\ell g(\nu)} \lambda_\ell$
- (β) $\nu_1 \triangleleft \nu_2 \Rightarrow \rho_{\nu_1} \triangleleft \rho_{\nu_2}$
- (γ) *if* $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \prod\limits_{\ell<n} \lambda_\ell$ *and* $m \le k < n$ *and* $\nu_2(m) < \nu_2(m)$ *then* $\eta_{\nu_1}(k) < \eta_{\nu_2}(m)$
- (δ) *if* $\nu \in \prod\limits_{i<\omega} \lambda_\ell$ *then* $\rho_\nu =: \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \rho_{\nu\restriction n}$ *is generic for* $(N, \mathbb{Q}_1)$
- (ε) *if* $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\omega} \lambda_\ell, \nu_0 <_{lex} \nu_1$ *then* $(\rho_{\nu_0}, \rho_{\nu_1})$ *is generic for* $(N, \mathbb{Q}_2)$ *hence*
- (ζ) *if* $\nu_0 \ne \nu_1 \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\omega} \lambda_\ell$ *then* $\neg \eta_{\nu_0} E \eta_{\nu_1}$.

2) Moreover, for some $p \in \mathbb{Q}_2, n(p) = 0$ and non-principal ultrafitler D on ω we have

$(*)$ *if* $\eta, \nu \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} s_1(A^p_n)$ *and* $\eta/D \ne \nu/D$ *then* $\neg \eta E \nu$.

Proof. Let $M_0 \prec_{L_{\aleph_1,\aleph_1}} N_0, \|M_0\| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, let $N = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} N_n$.
As above we choose p_n by induction on n such that:

(i) $p_n \in \mathbb{Q}_n$

(*ii*) $p_n \in N_n$

(*iii*) $n(p_0) = 0$

(*iv*) $p_n \leq_{pr} p_{n+1}$

(*v*) for every $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name of an ordinal $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in N_n$, for some $k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau}) \in [n, \omega)$ we have: if $\mathbb{Q}_2 \models$ "$p_{n+1} \leq q$" and $n(q) \geq k_n(\underset{\sim}{\tau})$ then q forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$

(*vi*) if $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in M_0$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name of a natural number then p_0 forces a value to it.

We can find $p_\omega \in \mathbb{Q}_2$ such that $n < \omega \Rightarrow p_n \leq_{pr} p_\omega$ and we can find p^* such that $p_\omega \leq p^*$ and $(\forall n)(\forall \beta)(\exists \alpha, \gamma)[\beta \in s_1(A_n^{p^*}) \rightarrow (\alpha, \beta), (\beta, \gamma) \in s_2(A_n^{p_\omega})]$ and we shall show that p^* is as required. Now clearly

⊠ if $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ and $(\forall \ell < 2)(\forall n < \omega)(\eta_\ell(n) \in s_1(A_n^{p^*})$ and for every $n < \omega$ large enough $(\eta_0(n), \eta_1(n)) \in s_2(A_n^{p^*})$ then

(*a*) for some subset G of $\mathbb{Q}_2^N$ generic over N we have $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_0[G] = \eta_0, \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1[G] = \eta_1$

(*b*) $\neg \eta_0 E \eta_1$
[why? by 3.13.]

This suffices for part (1): by clause (b) of Definition 3.2(1), we can find $Y_n \subseteq \lambda_n$ of cardinality μ_n^+ (really $\text{otp}(Y_n) = \mu_n \times \mu_{n-1} \times \ldots \times \mu_0$ is enough) such that for any $\alpha < \beta$ from $Y, (\alpha, \beta) \in s_2(A_n^p)$. Now we can choose by induction on $n, \langle \rho_\nu : \nu \in \prod\limits_{\ell<n} \mu_\ell \rangle$ as required in $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ of 3.15(1), they are as required.

For $B \subseteq \omega$ let $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_B$ be the following $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name:

$$\eta_B(n) \text{ is } \underset{\sim}{\eta}_0(n) \text{ if } n \in B \text{ and is } \underset{\sim}{\eta}_1(n) \text{ if } n \in \omega \backslash B.$$

Clearly $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_B$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name of a member of ${}^\omega\lambda$ and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_B \in M_0$ hence for $B_1, B_2 \subseteq \omega$ the following $\mathbb{Q}_2$-name of a truth value, Truth Value$(\underset{\sim}{\eta}_{B_1} E \underset{\sim}{\eta}_{B_2})$, is decided by p_0, say it is $\mathbf{t}(B_1, B_2)$.

Define a two place relation E' on $\mathscr{P}(\omega) : B_2 E' B_2$ iff $\mathbf{t}(B_1, B_2) =$ truth.

Let $J = \{B \subseteq \omega : \mathbf{t}(\emptyset, B) = \text{truth}\}$.

Clearly

$(*)_0$ E' is an equivalence relation on $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$

$(*)_1$ $\omega \notin J$, even $[n, \omega) \notin J$.

Let $\alpha^1_n < \alpha^2_n < \alpha^3_n < \alpha^4_n$ be from Y_n for $n < \omega$ and for $h \in {}^{\omega}\{1,2,3,4\}$ let $\nu_h \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ be $\nu_h(n) = \alpha^{h(n)}_n$. Easily

- $(*)_2$ if $B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 \subseteq \omega$ and $B_1 \backslash B_2 = B_3 \backslash B_4, B_2 \backslash B_1 = B_4 \backslash B_3$ then $\mathbf{t}(B_1, B_2) = \mathbf{t}(B_3, B_4)$ that is $B_1 E' B_2 \equiv B_3 E B'_4$
- $(*)_3$ if $B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 \subseteq \omega$ and $B_2 \triangle B_2 = B_3 \triangle B_4$ then $B_1 E' B_2 \equiv B_3 E' B_1$
  [why? this is the meaning of $(*)_2$]
- $(*)_4$ for $B_1, B_2 \subseteq \omega, B_1 E' B_2$ iff $B_1 \triangle B_2 \in J$
  [why? use $(*)_2$ with $B_1, B_2, B_1 \triangle B_2, \emptyset$ here standing for B_1, B_2, B_3 by there]
- $(*)_5$ $B_1 \subseteq B_2 \in J \Rightarrow B_2 \in J$
  [why? we can find $A_1, A - 2, A_3 \subseteq \omega$ such that $(A_1 \triangle A_2) = B_2 = (A_2 \triangle A_3)$ and $B_1 = A_1 \triangle A_3$ by the if part of $(*)_4$ we have $\mathbf{t}(A_1, A_2) =$ truth, $\mathbf{t}(A_2, A_3) =$ truth, by the definition of $\mathbf{t}$ we have $\mathbf{t}(A_1, A_3) =$ truth, hence by $(*)_4$ the only if part we have $B_1 = A_1 \triangle A_3 \in J$ as required]
- $(*)_6$ J is an ideal
  [why? by $(*)_5$ it is enough to show that for disjoint $B_1, B_2 \in J$ also $B = B_1 \cup B_2 \in J$. Now we have $B \triangle B_1 = B_2$ hence by $(*)_4$ we have $BE'B_1$ and $B_1 \triangle \emptyset = B_1 \in J$ hence $B_1 E' \emptyset$ hence $BE'\emptyset$; but by $(*)_4$ this implies $B \in J$ as required.]

So by $(*)_6$ there is an ultrafilter D on ω disjoint to J, and by $(*)_1$ it is non-principal, so we have proved also part (2). $\square_{3.15}$ $\square_{3.1}$

§4 The countable cofinality case: negative results

4.1 Claim. *Assume*

- (*a*) $\lambda > \ cf(\lambda) = \aleph_0$
- (*b*) $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)[|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda]$
- (*c*) *there is an algebra* $\mathfrak{B}$ *with universe* λ, *no infinite free subset and with* $< \lambda$ *functions.*

Then there is E *such that*

- (α) E *is an equivalence relation on* ${}^\omega\lambda$
- (β) E *is very nice (see Definition 0.2)*
- (γ) *if* $\eta, \nu \in {}^\omega\lambda$ *and* $\eta =^* \nu$ *(i.e.* $(\exists^{<\aleph_0} n)(\eta(n) \neq \nu(n))$ *then* $\eta E \nu \Leftrightarrow \eta = \nu$
- (δ) E *has* λ *equivalence classes.*

4.2 Remark. 1) We can replace ${}^\omega\lambda$ by the set of increasing ω-sequences or by $\prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ when $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \lambda = \sum\limits_{m<\omega} \lambda_m$ or by $\{A \subseteq \lambda : (\forall n)(\exists! \alpha)(\alpha \in A \ \& \ \sum\limits_{\ell<n} \lambda_\ell \leq \alpha < \lambda_n)$.
2) We can omit clause (b) if we weaken clause (γ). We can imitate 3.3, 3.4, 3.5.

Proof. Without loss of generality $\mathfrak{B}$ has $\aleph_0$ function and the individual constants $\{\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_0\}$ where $\lambda_0 < \lambda$.

We define E_0 on ${}^\omega\lambda$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\eta E_0 \nu \ \underline{\text{iff}} : &\text{ if } n < \omega, \sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \text{ a } \mathfrak{B}\text{-term, and}\\ &k, k_1, \ldots, k_n < \omega \text{ then}\\ &\eta(k) = \sigma(\eta(k_1), \eta(k_2), \ldots, \eta(k_n)) \Leftrightarrow \nu(k) = \sigma(\nu(k_1), \nu(k_2), \ldots, \nu(k_n)).\end{aligned}$$

So E_0 is an equivalence relation with $\leq \lambda_0^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$ equivalence classes. For $\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda$ let $A(\eta) = \{k :$ for some $k^* < \omega$ there are no $n < \omega, k_1, \ldots, k_n \in [k^*, \omega)$ and $\mathfrak{B}$-term $\sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that $\eta(k) = \sigma(\eta(k_1), \ldots, \eta(k_n))\}$.
Lastly, we define E_1 by

$$\eta E_1 \nu \text{ iff } \eta E_0 \nu \ \& \ \eta \restriction A(\eta) = \nu \restriction A(\nu).$$

The rest is as in §3. $\square_{4.1}$

4.3 Claim. *1) In 4.1 we can demand*

(δ) *for each* $\eta \in {}^{\omega}\lambda, \eta/J^{bd}_{\omega}$ *is a set of representatives of* E.

2) We can weaken in 4.1 assumption (b) to

$(b)'$ $(\aleph_0 + |\tau(\mathfrak{B})|)^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$.

3) If in 4.1 we change clause (γ) *in the conclusion to* $(\gamma)^-$ *below, we can omit clause (b) of the assumption*

$(\gamma)^-$ *for every equivalence class* X *of* E *for every* $\eta \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$ *and for some* $\alpha, \eta_{n,\alpha} \in X$ *where* $\eta_{\alpha,n} \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$ *is:* $\eta_{\alpha,n}(\ell) = \alpha$ *if* $\ell = n$ *and* $\eta_{\alpha,n}(\ell) = \eta(\ell)$ *otherwise.*

Proof. 1) We imitate 3.3 only letting $\Xi_\eta = \big\{\{\langle k, k_1, \dots, k_n, \sigma\rangle : \nu(k) = \sigma(k_1, \dots, k_n)\} : \nu \in {}^{\omega}\lambda, \nu/J^{bd}_{\omega} = \eta/J^{bd}_{\omega}\big\}$.
2) The same proof.
3) For $\eta \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$ let $\mathbf{n}(\eta) < \omega$ be the minimal $n \in [\mathbf{n}(\eta), \omega) \Rightarrow c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}\{\eta(\ell) : \ell \in [n, \omega)\} = c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}\{\eta(\ell) : \ell \in [\mathbf{n}(\eta), \omega)\}$. Let K be an additive group with universe λ, K_1 a subgroup, $|K_1| = \lambda, (K : K_1) = \lambda$ and $\eta E \nu$ iff $\sum\limits_{n < \mathbf{n}(\eta)} \eta(n) = \sum\limits_{n < n(\nu)} \nu(\eta)$ mod K_1.

$\square_{4.3}$

Question: What about having $\sigma \in (\lambda, 2^{\lambda})$ equivalence classes?

§5 On $r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})$

5.1 Definition. For an abelian group G and prime p let $r_p(G)$ be the rank of G/pG as a vector space over $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

Instead using a definition of the abelian group $\mathrm{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})$, for G torsion free abelian group we quote (see [Fu]).

5.2 Claim. *For a torsion free abelian group G and prime $p, r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(g,\mathbb{Z}))$ is the rank of Hom$(G,\mathbb{Z}/pZ)/($Hom$(G,\mathbb{Z})/p\mathbb{Z})$ where Hom$(G,\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ is the abelian group of homomorphisms from G to $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, Hom$(\mathbb{Z},G)/p\mathbb{Z}$ is the abelian group of homomorphism h from G to $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ such that for some homomorphism g from G to $\mathbb{Z}$ we have $x \in G \Rightarrow g(x)/\mathbb{Z} \in h(x)$.*

More generally (see [Sh 664])

5.3 Definition. 1) We say $\mathscr{Y} = (\bar{A},\bar{K},\bar{G},\bar{D},\bar{g}^*)$ is a λ-system if

- (A) $\bar{A} = \langle A_i : i \leq \lambda\rangle$ is an increasing sequence of sets, $A = A_\lambda = \cup\{A_i : i < \lambda\}$
- (B) $\bar{K} = \langle K_t : t \in A\rangle$ is a sequence of finite groups
- (C) $\bar{G} = \langle G_i : i \leq \lambda\rangle$ is a sequence of groups, $G_i \subseteq \prod\limits_{t\in A_i} K_t$, each G_i is closed and $i < j \leq \lambda \Rightarrow G_i = \{g \restriction A_i : g \in G_j\}$ and $G_\lambda = \{g \in \prod\limits_{t\in A_\lambda} K_t : (\forall i < \lambda)(g \restriction A_i \in G_i)\}$
- (D) $\bar{D} = \langle D_\delta : \delta \leq \lambda$ (a limit ordinal)$\rangle, D_\delta$ an ultrafilter on δ such that $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow [\alpha,\delta) \in D_\delta$
- (E) $\bar{g}^* = \langle g^*_i : i < \lambda\rangle, g^*_i \in G_\lambda$ and $g^*_i \restriction A_i = e_{G_i} = \langle e_{K_t} : t \in A_i\rangle$.

Of course, formally we should write $A^{\mathscr{Y}}_i, K^{\mathscr{Y}}_t, G^{\mathscr{Y}}_\delta, D^{\mathscr{Y}}_\delta, g^{\mathscr{Y}}_i$, eta., if clear from the context we shall not write this.
2) Let $\mathscr{Y}^-$ be the same omitting D_λ and we call it a lean λ-system.

We can deduce Sageev Shelah [SgSh 148] result (if $|G| = \lambda$ is weakly compact $(> \aleph_0)$ and p is prime, then $r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) \geq \lambda \Rightarrow r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^\lambda$). For this note

5.4 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) *$\mathscr{Y}$ is a λ-system* (*b*) $\bar H = \langle H_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ *is a sequence of groups,* $\bar\pi = \langle \pi_{i,j} : i < j < \lambda \rangle$, $\pi_{i,j} \in$ *Hom*(H_j, H_i), *commuting*

(*c*) $\bar h = \langle h_i : i < \lambda \rangle, h_i \in$ *Hom*$(H_i, G_i^{\mathscr{Y}})$, *and* $i < j < \lambda$ & $x \in H_j \Rightarrow (h_j(x)) \restriction A_i = h_i(\pi_{i,j}(x))$

(*d*) $H_\lambda, \pi_{i,\lambda}\,(i < \lambda)$ *form the inverse limit of* $\langle H_i, \pi_{i,j} : i < j < \lambda \rangle$, *and* $h = h_\lambda$ *the inverse limit of* $\langle h_i : i < \lambda \rangle$

(*e*) E_h *is the following 2-place relation on* $G_\lambda : f_1 E f_2 \Leftrightarrow f_1 f_2^{-1} \in$ *Rang*(h).

Then

(α) $h \in$ *Hom*(H_λ, G_λ)

(β) *if* $(\forall i < \lambda)(|A_i| \le \lambda$ & $|H_i| \le \lambda)$, *then* E_h *is a* $\Sigma^1_1[\lambda]$*-equivalence relation*

(γ) *if* $(\forall i < \lambda)(|A_i| < \lambda$ & $|H_i| < \lambda)$ *and* λ *is weakly compact uncountable, then the 2-place relation* $E = E_h$ *on* G_λ *defined by* $f_1 E f_2 \Leftrightarrow f_1 f_2^{-1} \in$ *Rang*(h) *is very nice*

(δ) *under* (γ)*'s assumptions, if* $(G :$ *Rang*$(h)) \ge \lambda$ *then* $(G :$ *Rang*$(h)) = 2^\lambda$.

2) If for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \le \lambda$ *we have* $\langle H^\varepsilon_i : i < \lambda \rangle, \langle \pi^\varepsilon_{i,j} : i < j < \lambda \rangle, \langle h^\varepsilon_i : i \le \lambda \rangle$ *as above, and for every* $\alpha < \lambda$ *there are* $f^\alpha_i \in G_\lambda$ *(for* $i < \alpha$*) such that* $\neg(f^\alpha_i E_{h^\varepsilon_\lambda} f^\alpha_j)$ *for* $i < j < \alpha$, *then there are* $f_i \in G$ *for* $i < 2^\lambda$ *such that* $i < j < 2^\lambda$ & $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \Rightarrow \neg(f_i E_{h_\varepsilon} f_j)$.

Proof. Straight. (The main point is in clause (γ) of 5.4(1), the point is that if $f \in G_\lambda \setminus$ Rang(h_λ) then for some $i < \lambda$ we have $\pi_{i,\lambda}(f) \in G_i \setminus$ Rang(h_i) by the tree property of λ). $\square_{5.4}$

5.5 Claim. *Assume*

(*A*)(*a*) λ *is a strong limit cardinal and* θ *is a compact cardinal* $< \lambda$

(*b*) K_i *is a group for* $i < \lambda$

(*c*) I *is a directed partial order,* $t \in I \Rightarrow A(t) \subseteq \lambda$ *and* $\bigcup\limits_{t \in I} A(t) = \lambda$

(*d*) *for* $t \in I, G_t$ *is a subgroup of* $\prod\limits_{i \in u}\{K_i : i \in A(t)\}$

(*e*) *for* $s \le t$ *from* I *we have* $A(s) \subseteq A(t)$ *and* $f \in G_t \Rightarrow f \restriction A(s) \in G_s$

(*f*) G_∞ *is the inverse limit*

(*B*)(*a*) $\varepsilon(*) \le \lambda$

(b) *for* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*), \langle H^\varepsilon_u, \pi^\varepsilon_{u,w} : u \leq w$ *from* $I\rangle$ *is an inversely directed system of groups*

(c) $h^\varepsilon_u \in$ *Hom*(H^ε_u, G_u) *for* $u \in I, \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)$

(d) $H^\varepsilon_\infty, h^\varepsilon, h^\varepsilon_{\infty,u}$ *are the limit of the inverse system*

(e) E_ε *is the equivalence relation on* $G_\infty : fE_\varepsilon g \Leftrightarrow fg^{-1} \in$ *Rang*(h^ε_∞)

(C) *for every* $\mu < \lambda$ *we can find* $\langle f^\mu_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\rangle$ *from* G_∞ *such that* $\varepsilon < \mu \cap \varepsilon(*)$ & $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \neg(f^\mu_\alpha E_\varepsilon f^\mu_\beta)$

(D) θ *is* $> \sup\limits_{i<\lambda}|K_i| + \sup\limits_{t\in I}|A(t)|$ *and also* $\sup_{t\in I,\varepsilon<\varepsilon(*)}|H^\varepsilon_t|$.

Then *there are* $f_\alpha \in G$ *for* $\alpha < 2^\lambda$ *such that* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)$ & $\alpha < \beta = 2^\lambda \Rightarrow \neg(f_\alpha E_\varepsilon f_\beta)$.

Proof. Let $\kappa = \text{cf}(\lambda), \langle\lambda_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ be increasing with limit λ. We can choose by induction on $i < \kappa, I_i, A_i$ such that

(α) $A_i \subseteq \lambda, |A_i| < \lambda, j < i \Rightarrow A_j \subseteq A_i, \lambda_i \subseteq A_i$

(β) $I_i \subseteq I$ is directed, $|I_i| < \lambda, j < i \Rightarrow I_j \subseteq I_i$ and $t \in I_i \Rightarrow A(t) \subseteq A_i$

(γ) if we restrict ourselves to A_i, I_i, there is $\langle f^i_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_i\rangle$, such that $f^i_\alpha \in G^{I_i}_\infty = \text{Lim}_{I_i}\langle G_u, f_{u,w} : u \leq w \text{ from } I_i\rangle$ and $\varepsilon < \mu_i \cap \varepsilon(*)$ & $\alpha < \mu_i \Rightarrow \neg(f^i_\alpha E^{I_i} f^i_\beta)$.

Now we can apply [Sh 664, §3]. $\square_{5.5}$

5.6 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda >$ *cf*$(\lambda) = \kappa$, *and* κ *is a measurable cardinal, say* D *a normal ultrafilter on* κ

(b) G *is a torsion free abelian group*

(c) $|G| = \lambda$

(d) p *is a prime number.*

1) If $r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z})) \geq \lambda$ *and* $\lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$ *then* $r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z})) \geq \lambda^\kappa$.

2) Let $\lambda = \sum\limits_{i<\kappa}\lambda_i$*; then* $r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z}))$ *is* $\prod\limits_{i<\kappa}\mu_i/D$ *for some* $\mu_i \leq 2^{\lambda_i}$.

Proof. 1) Let $\langle G_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ be an increasing sequence of pure subgroups of G with union G satisfying $i < \kappa \Rightarrow |G_i| < \lambda$. Now

($*$) if $g \in \text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ and $i < \kappa \Rightarrow g \restriction G_i \in \text{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})/p\mathbb{Z}$ then $g \in \text{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})/p\mathbb{Z}$.

Why? Let $g \restriction G_i = h_i/p\mathbb{Z}$ where $h_i \in \operatorname{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})$ and let h a function from G to $\mathbb{Z}$ be defined as $h(x) = n \Leftrightarrow \{i < \kappa : h_i(x) = n\} \in D$. Clearly $h \in \operatorname{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})$ and $g = h/p\mathbb{Z}$, as required.]

The rest should be clear.
2) As in part (1), letting $\mu_i = r_p(\operatorname{Ext}(G_i,\mathbb{Z}))$. $\square_{5.6}$

5.7 Conclusion. If λ is a strong limit and above a compact cardinal and G is a torsion free abelian group and p is a prime then $r_p(\operatorname{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) \geq \lambda \Rightarrow r_p(\operatorname{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^{\lambda}$.

Proof. By 5.6.

5.8 Remark. So for λ strong limit singular the problem of the existence of G such that $|G| = \lambda, r_p(\operatorname{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = \lambda$ is not similar to the problem of the existence of M such that $\|M\| = \lambda$, $\operatorname{nu}(M) = \lambda$.

REFERENCES.

[References of the form `math.XX/···` refer to the `xxx.lanl.gov` archive]

[Fu] Laszlo Fuchs. *Infinite Abelan Groups*, volume I, II. Academic Press, New York, 1970, 1973.

[GrSh 302] Rami Grossberg and Saharon Shelah. On the structure of $\mathrm{Ext}_p(G, \mathbb{Z})$. *Journal of Algebra*, **121**:117–128, 1989. See also [GrSh:302a] below.

[GrSh 302a] Rami Grossberg and Saharon Shelah. On cardinalities in quotients of inverse limits of groups. *Mathematica Japonica*, **47**(2):189–197, 1998. `math.LO/9911225`

[MRSh 314] Alan H. Mekler, Andrzej Rosłanowski, and Saharon Shelah. On the p-rank of Ext. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **112**:327–356, 1999. `math.LO/9806165`

[PaSr98] N. Pandey and S. M. Srivastava. A Powerless Proof of a Result of Shelah on Fundamental Groups. *Preprint*.

[SgSh 148] Gershon Sageev and Saharon Shelah. Weak compactness and the structure of $\mathrm{Ext}(A, \mathbf{Z})$. In *Abelian group theory (Oberwolfach, 1981)*, volume 874 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 87–92. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981. ed. Goebel, R. and Walker, A.E.

[Sh 664] Saharon Shelah. Strong dichotomy of cardinality. *Results in Mathematics*, **accepted**. `math.LO/9807183`

[Sh 124] Saharon Shelah. $\aleph_\omega$ may have a strong partition relation. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **38**:283–288, 1981.

[Sh 273] Saharon Shelah. Can the fundamental (homotopy) group of a space be the rationals? *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **103**:627–632, 1988.

[Sh 262] Saharon Shelah. The number of pairwise non-elementarily-embeddable models. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **54**:1431–1455, 1989.

[Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **116**:285–321, 2000. `math.LO/9809200`

[ShVs 719] Saharon Shelah and Pauli Väisänen. On equivalence relations Σ^1_1–definable over $H(\kappa)$. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **submitted**. `math.LO/9911231`